

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are currently pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 7 being independent.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,085,591 to *Gancarcik et al.* in view of Pub. No. US 2003/0197488 A1 of *Hulvey*, and Claims 3-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gancarcik* in view of *Hulvey* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,638 to *Larsson* or U.S. Patent No. 6,795,688 to *Plasson*.

In rejecting independent Claims 1 and 7, the Examiner alleges that *Gancarcik* discloses “a controller for transmitting a wired communication request signal (request for wired communication service) which includes a user-entered phone number to a wired phone 12 via the first Bluetooth module on an established Bluetooth link”, citing, *inter alia*, Col. 2, line 12-30, line 60, to Col. 3, line 46, of *Gancarcik*. The portion of *Gancarcik* relied upon by the Examiner states that a “bi-directional serial communication link 15 ... may either be a wired connection communication protocol such as USB or RS-232 or a wireless communication protocol such as Bluetooth or IrDA.” (Col. 2, line 67, to Col. 3, line 3, of *Gancarcik*). That is, *Gancarcik* merely discloses an alternative arrangement between a PDA and a telephone via a wireless or wired connection.

However, it is respectfully submitted that the alternative arrangement of either a wired communication or a wireless communication as taught by *Gancarcik* still fails to disclose or suggest a communication link that allows the Bluetooth wireless terminal to maintain wireless communication service with the wired network via the wired phone based upon an ID key for selecting a service between a wired communication service and a wireless communication service, as

recited in independent Claims 1 and 7.

The ‘established Bluetooth link’ of *Gancarcik* that the Examiner relies upon merely allows a PDA 14 to communicate with the telephone set 12 via bi-directional serial communication link 15. (See *Gancarcik*, Col. 2, lines 66-67.) This ‘established Bluetooth link’ is used to pass a “call command...from the PDA to the telephone set and vice versa.” (Col. 2, lines 12-23, of *Gancarcik*). That is, the wirelessly enabled PDA of *Gancarcik* is used for “processing of the data (e.g., numbers to be called).” (Col. 2, line 26, of *Gancarcik*). It is respectfully submitted that neither the wirelessly enabled PDA, the ‘established Bluetooth link’, nor any other disclosure of *Gancarcik* discloses or suggests maintaining a wireless communication with the wired network via the wired phone based upon an ID key for selecting a service between a wired communication service and a wireless communication service, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 7.

Further, the Examiner admits that *Gancarcik* does not teach that the Bluetooth link has been manually established via a user interface, but asserts that it is known in the art as taught by *Hulvey*, and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of *Hulvey* into the method of *Gancarcik*.

It is respectfully submitted that *Hulvey* merely discloses wireless interface device communications between a wirelessly enabled host and at least one user input device. More specifically, *Hulvey* discloses an inquiry process to pair devices, e.g., mouse to host, keyboard to host. The master device finds the identity of the Bluetooth devices in its transmission/reception range by using the inquiry process. (In Fig. 11 and par [0065]-[0066]). However, the inquiry of the communication taught by *Hulvey* fails to disclose or suggest transmitting a request for a wired communication service to a wired phone network via a slave Bluetooth module of a wireless terminal based upon an ID key for selecting a service between a wired communication service and a wireless communication service, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 7. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that *Hulvey* fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Gancarcik* described above.

Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above, Applicant believes independent Claims 1 and 7 are patentable over the combination of *Gancarcik* and *Hulvey*, and respectfully requests that the rejections thereof are withdrawn.

While not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, Applicant believes Claims 2-5 and 8-11 are also patentable for at least the above reasons.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-5, and 7-11 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Douglas M. Ownes III', is written over a horizontal line.

Douglas M. Ownes III
Reg. No. 51,314
Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, LLP
290 Broadhollow Road, Suite 210E
Melville, New York 11747
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475